-/ C 2175-1 A -

CH IF08WS1EC184SAMPLE 6 XE
CONGRESSIONAL INFORMATION
7101 WISCONSIN AV/NW
WASHINGTON DC 20014

CHRONICLE of Higher Education

ISSN 0009-5982

February 10, 1982 • $1.25
Volume XXIII, Number 22

News Summary

Articles on inside pages

Nonselective colleges should reconsider requiring their applicants to submit standardized-test scores, says a National Research Council report. Story and excerpts on Page 9.

A run-off election will be held in April to decide what union will represent faculty members in the California State University system. Story on Page 8.

President Reagan has won few supporters on Capitol Hill for his bill to bar tax exemptions for racially discriminatory educational institutions. Story on Page 11.

Deep new cuts in federal support for higher education—including elimination of three student-aid programs—are proposed in President Reagan's fiscal 1983 budget. Story on Page 11.

The General Accounting Office is not sure a new GI Bill is a "cost-effective" way to attract recruits to the all-volunteer armed forces. Story on Page 16.

Three annual federal surveys that provide a "national data base" for colleges and universities may no longer be carried out by the National Center for Education Statistics. Story on Page 12.

Kentucky's plan for desegregating its public higher-education system has been accepted "provisionally" by the Education Department. Story on Page 15.

Delight, anger, and calls to lawyers were among the reactions of universities rated by *The New York Times Selective Guide to Colleges*. Story on Page 19.

Strict controls remain on academic life in Poland despite the reported reopening of most universities. Story on Page 17.

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

Books	19-22
Bulletin Board	27-55
Calendar of Events	24-26
Canadian News	17-18
Deadlines	26
Deaths	24
Fact-Files	8, 10
Gazette	24
Grants	24
International News	17-18
Letters	23
Marginalia	2
News in Brief	2-3
Notes from Baltimore	3
Point of View	56
Washington News	14-16

'WORSE THAN THE GREAT DEPRESSION'

Falling State Revenues, Cuts in Payrolls Bring Hard Times to Public Institutions

By JACK MAGARRELL

For most states, and for the public colleges and universities that depend on state funds for the largest part of their income, hard times are here.

In 21 states, revenues this year have fallen below official forecasts. In 24, public payrolls have been cut in the past year.

In fiscal 1981, at least 19 states reduced spending to below the amounts originally appropriated.

"We face a financial problem that can still be estimated only in approximate terms," says Ohio State University's President Edward H. Jennings, "but even the estimates are twice the percentage of cutbacks we faced in the Great Depression."

Mr. Jennings invoked the specter of the 1930's in explaining to faculty members his plan for reducing spending at Ohio State by $19.6-million between now and June 30.

"In most states, budget deliberations this year will be more excruciating than usual," concluded the National Conference of State Legislatures after a nationwide survey.

Tax Collections Down

In state after state, tax collections are lower and slower than last year because of higher unemployment, lower farm prices, and general recession.

"Adjusted farm income last year was the lowest of any year since the Great Depression," said Iowa Gov. Robert D. Ray in his state-of-the-state message.

At the same time, states are receiving less money from the federal government. The National Conference of State Legislatures says cutbacks in federal aid were not the primary cause of the state's financial distress, "but they exacerbate it."

Utah's Gov. Scott M. Matheson says that three years ago federal funds amounted to 25 per cent of his state's budget. Now federal funds have declined to 20 per cent, he says, "and we can expect that trend to continue."

Mr. Matheson, in dealing with requests for higher-education funds in his state, has adopted President Reagan's techniques of new federalism and block grants and lets the board of regents decide where reductions fall.

"My approach to funding education pro-

Continued on Page 6, Column 1

State Support per Student Varies Dramatically

WASHINGTON

State support of public colleges and universities this year varies from as little as $1,943 per student in New Hampshire to as much as $6,608 in Wyoming and $12,712 in Alaska.

North Dakota's legislature has earmarked more than 20 per cent of its total tax revenue for higher education—more than any other state. In Massachusetts, higher education gets only 5 per cent of the state's total tax revenue.

Such dramatic inequalities among the states reflect fundamental differences in wealth, population, taxation levels, and type of educational system, all of which complicate state-to-state comparisons.

An analysis of appropriations that takes into account a number of basic differences among the states has been developed by D. Kent Halstead, a senior research associate at the National Institute of Education.

Mr. Halstead's study is an attempt to provide a more thorough analysis of current appropriations in time to assist officials in higher education and the state legislatures who are developing budgets for colleges and universities for the next fiscal year.

Nationally, this year's average appropriation per student was $3,682, which represented 10.8 per cent of total state and local tax revenue, the Halstead study shows.

New York, for example, ranked forty-fifth in the portion of its revenue—7.8 per cent—earmarked for higher education, but its appropriation per student, $4,795, was the third largest in the country.

If local and state tax rates in New York had been at the national average in 1980, the state would have raised $838 per person.

Because its rates were 70 per cent above that average, New York raised $1,432 per

Continued on Page 8, Column 1

A CASE IN POINT

Massachusetts System Thrown into Turmoil by a Wrangle over Finances and Governance

By ROBERT L. JACOBSON

BOSTON

An expert on state systems of higher education calls it "the worst example of legislative meddling" he's ever seen. A state higher-education official here in Massachusetts calls it "political cowardice."

But the influential chairman of the ways and means committee of the Massachusetts State Senate, Chester G. Atkins, says such interpretations of recent events here are "dead wrong."

Legislative leaders are not trying to usurp authority over the state's 30-campus system of public higher education, he says. Nor have they changed their minds about giving substantial power to a newly established statewide board of regents.

It is simply that the system is going through the "intermediate" phase of a major revision of its governance, Mr. Atkins maintains.

Either way, it is clear that the public colleges and universities in Massachusetts have been thrown into considerable turmoil over the past year and a half, and it remains to be seen where they are headed both financially and structurally. Their problems illustrate how hard it can be for state authorities to reshape higher education in a time of retrenchment.

■

What upsets many people in the higher-education system is not only what the legislature has been doing, but also how it has been doing it. Legislative budget makers can't seem to stay out of educational decision making, the critics contend.

They point out, for example, that when the legislature voted in 1980 to set up a 15-member board of regents—and thereby scrap the entire system's previous governing structure—it did so through a rider to the state's annual appropriations bill.

In addition to creating the new board, the measure eliminated both the office of the state education secretary and the statewide coordinating board for higher education, as well as several other multi-campus boards.

The action took academic leaders by surprise. It also bypassed the legislature's

Continued on Page 4, Column 1

State Support

Continued from Page 1

person, second only to Alaska's $3,692, according to the Halstead analysis.

The Halstead study shows that enrollment of full-time-equivalent students per 1,000 population varies from 43.5 in Arizona to 19.1 in Pennsylvania.

Current data on state appropriations for higher education have been compiled each fall since 1958 by M. M. Chambers, professor of education administration at Illinois State University, and have been published every fall since 1967 by *The Chronicle*.

In addition to the appropriation amounts provided by Mr. Chambers, *The Chronicle* in recent years has added figures that compensate for state-to-state differences in wealth and population.

5 Criteria

The latest Chambers figures (*The Chronicle*, October 21, 1981), for example, show each state's higher-education appropriations per $1,000 of personal income and per capita. *The Chronicle* analysis of the Chambers data also includes an adjustment for inflation.

The table at right gives Mr. Halstead's rankings of the states according to five criteria: the enrollment of full-time-equivalent students in public colleges and universities per 1,000 population; each state's tax rates as a percentage of the national average; state and local tax revenue per capita; percentage of state and local tax revenues allocated to higher education, and appropriations per full-time-equivalent student in public colleges and universities.

Other Rankings

Other rankings from the Halstead analysis, which will be published in future issues of *The Chronicle*, include estimated tuition per student, the ratio of tuition revenue to appropriated funds, high-school graduates per 1,000 population, public-college enrollment per high-school graduate, and appropriations adjusted for inflation and a "systems cost index" of variations in state systems of higher education.

Mr. Halstead's "system cost index" is intended to adjust costs for differences in support required by different types of institution. A state in which the emphasis is on research universities will require greater appropriations per student than a state where most of the enrollment is in community colleges.

The national average appropriation per student in a two-year academic program in fiscal 1979, Mr. Halstead says, was $1,789. For two-year occupational programs, the average was $2,095.

Some 1980 Data Used

At research universities where sponsored research programs exceeded $50-million, the national average appropriation per student was $4,187 at those with medical programs and $3,380 at those without.

More than half the public-college enrollment in Hawaii and Iowa was in large research universities. In California and Florida, more than half the public enrollment was in two-year academic programs.

To avoid delay in publication of his analysis, Mr. Halstead uses year-old data on enrollment, taxable value, tax revenue, tuition, and population. Thus the 1981-82 appropriations are analyzed in terms of data from 1980.

Copies of the full study have been distributed to statewide higher-education agencies in each state. Additional copies will be available after March 1 for $5.14 each ($1.11 each in microfiche) from the Educational Resources Information Center, Document Reproduction Service, Box 190, Arlington, Va. 22210.

—JACK MAGARRELL

FACT-FILE

How the 50 States Rank

1. By public-college enrollment per 1,000 population
2. By percentage of U.S. average tax effort
3. By state and local tax revenue per capita
4. By percentage of revenue spent on higher education
5. By appropriations per full-time student

	1		2		3		4		5	
	Enrollment per 1,000 population (a)		Per cent of U.S. average tax effort (b)		Tax revenue per capita (c)		Revenue spent on higher education (d)		Appropriations per student (e)	
	Number	Rank	Per cent	Rank	Amount	Rank	Per cent	Rank	Amount	Rank
Alabama	30.8	20	82.8%	35	$ 612.90	50	17.6%	4	$ 3,498	24
Alaska	24.1	40	166.4%	2	3,692.80	1	8.3%	42	12,712	1
Arizona	43.5	1	103.3%	12	978.20	15	14.2%	12	3,193	30
Arkansas	23.4	41	84.4%	32	641.50	47	12.6%	24	3,441	38
California	39.0	3	95.7%	19	1,104.30	7	14.4%	10	4,087	4
Colorado	37.8	5	87.6%	27	968.30	17	11.2%	32	2,874	47
Connecticut	21.7	48	102.3%	13	1,059.20	10	7.9%	44	3,862	6
Delaware	38.7	4	87.4%	28	939.50	20	12.9%	20	3,129	33
Florida	23.0	43	69.0%	48	708.30	43	11.5%	31	3,547	12
Georgia	20.5	49	92.8%	20	750.40	37	12.3%	26	4,492	11
Hawaii	34.4	11	122.9%	4	1,261.20	4	12.7%	23	4,662	10
Idaho	28.2	27	81.0%	36	735.10	40	14.1%	13	3,688	8
Illinois	27.3	30	95.8%	18	1,049.00	11	9.6%	38	3,676	20
Indiana	26.0	34	78.0%	41	736.80	39	11.9%	28	3,377	35
Iowa	28.4	26	90.7%	22	957.60	18	12.2%	27	4,101	26
Kansas	37.2	7	86.1%	30	909.30	23	14.7%	9	3,587	36
Kentucky	24.4	39	80.4%	38	689.60	44	14.1%	14	3,975	19
Louisiana	26.7	31	74.5%	44	808.80	30	13.3%	19	4,017	21
Maine	21.7	46	108.5%	8	845.60	26	7.6%	47	2,948	37
Maryland	30.1	23	106.0%	9	1,024.60	13	9.9%	37	3,383	41
Massachusetts	22.4	44	137.1%	3	1,230.50	5	5.0%	50	2,764	34
Michigan	33.7	12	105.4%	10	1,060.80	9	9.5%	39	2,993	42
Minnesota	29.8	24	105.2%	11	1,079.80	8	11.6%	30	4,194	17
Mississippi	30.3	22	90.9%	21	637.00	48	19.5%	2	4,108	13
Missouri	25.4	38	79.3%	40	742.90	38	10.3%	34	3,008	39
Montana	33.4	13	88.3%	26	984.60	14	11.1%	33	3,257	23
Nebraska	34.8	10	100.4%	16	940.90	19	14.0%	15	3,773	45
Nevada	26.2	33	49.6%	50	812.60	29	10.2%	35	3,158	14
New Hampshire	22.0	45	72.7%	46	688.60	45	6.2%	49	1,945	50
New Jersey	21.7	47	113.3%	6	1,118.10	6	6.2%	48	3,207	28
New Mexico	31.5	17	80.9%	37	845.70	25	16.1%	7	4,320	15
New York	23.3	42	170.8%	1	1,432.50	2	7.8%	45	4,795	3
North Carolina	30.5	21	89.6%	25	725.10	42	17.5%	5	4,156	5
North Dakota	43.0	2	76.0%	43	809.30	31	20.7%	1	3,890	9
Ohio	25.7	36	83.3%	34	797.00	32	8.3%	41	2,572	48
Oklahoma	32.0	15	70.0%	47	794.60	33	13.7%	16	3,406	43
Oregon	36.1	9	90.1%	23	933.10	21	12.9%	21	3,320	32
Pennsylvania	19.1	50	101.7%	14	912.60	22	7.6%	46	3,613	22
Rhode Island	26.1	35	119.1%	5	975.20	16	9.2%	40	3,458	25
South Carolina	27.8	29	89.9%	24	682.80	46	16.7%	6	4,112	16
South Dakota	29.7	25	83.6%	33	758.40	36	10.0%	36	2,545	46
Tennessee	25.4	37	80.0%	39	631.60	49	12.3%	25	3,059	44
Texas	31.7	16	62.4%	49	763.00	35	18.1%	3	4,354	7
Utah	33.0	14	96.4%	17	827.30	28	14.4%	11	3,609	40
Vermont	27.8	28	101.1%	15	838.00	27	8.0%	43	2,403	49
Virginia	31.4	18	85.5%	31	792.90	34	12.8%	22	3,237	27
Washington	36.4	8	86.9%	29	891.80	24	13.5%	18	3,308	29
West Virginia	26.3	32	76.2%	42	728.90	41	13.5%	17	3,742	18
Wisconsin	37.4	6	110.7%	7	1,048.20	12	11.8%	29	3,314	31
Wyoming	30.9	19	74.0%	45	1,387.90	3	14.7%	8	6,608	2
U.S. average	**29.0**		**100.0%**		**$ 986.50**		**10.8%**		**$3,682**	

(a) Number of full-time-equivalent students enrolled in public colleges and universities per 1,000 population in the fall of 1980.
(b) State and local tax revenue in 1980 as a percentage of the revenue that would be collected if the state's wealth were taxed at national average rates.
(c) State and local tax revenue per capita in 1980.
(d) Per cent of total state and local tax revenue appropriated for current operating expenses of public higher education in 1981-82. Appropriations data from M.M. Chambers, Illinois State University.
(e) Appropriations of state and local tax revenue for current operating expenses of public higher education per full-time-equivalent student in 1981-82.

SOURCE: D. KENT HALSTEAD, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Run-Off Scheduled in California Collective-Bargaining Election

By JACK McCURDY

SACRAMENTO, CAL.

A run-off election will be held about April 1 to determine which of two unions will be the collective-bargaining agent for nearly 20,000 faculty members in the California State University system.

Balloting in the first faculty collective-bargaining election in the 19-campus system ended last week with neither union receiving a majority of the votes cast.

The United Professors of California, affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers (A.F.L.-C.I.O.), received 6,316 votes. The Congress of Faculty Associations, affiliated with the American Association of University Professors and with the National Education Association, received 6,267. There were 2,400 votes against having a collective-bargaining agent.

State officials said 15,424 ballots were cast, representing 80 per cent of the 19,329 full-time and part-time faculty members who were eligible to take part in the election.

A run-off election is also required between the two unions to determine which will represent the system's academic-support employees, such as librarians and counselors.

Those employees cast 505 votes for the United Professors of California, 391 for the Congress of Faculty Associations, and 123 for no agent.

Results of the run-off elections are expected about May 1.

In a third bargaining election, the system's 140 physicians and dentists chose the Union of American Physicians and Dentists, an independent unit, as their agent. The physicians and dentists cast 83 votes for the union, 19 for no agent, and 3 for the United Professors of California.

The large turnout in the faculty election was applauded by both unions, whose spokesmen said it demonstrated that faculty members wanted collective bargaining. The system's trustees and the administration had expressed hope that the faculty would reject collective bargaining.

The delay imposed by the run-off election means the final winner will not be certified as agent in time to engage in collective bargaining for a contract this year.

The California law authorizing collective bargaining by faculty members at the state's colleges and universities was passed in 1978. Both unions have expressed frustration over delays in holding a bargaining election and starting negotiations for the first contract.